UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,584	09/08/2003	Joerg Beringer	09282.0010-00000	1932

60668   7590   08/03/2010
SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
JAMI, HARES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 May 2010</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-11,14-20,25,27,29,30,32-37 and 39-46* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5-11,14-20,25,27,29,30,32-37 and 39-46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/04/2010</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the amendment filed on 05/03/2010. Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-20, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32-37, and 39-46 are pending in this Action. Claims 2, 4, 12, 13, 21-24, 26, 28, 31, and 38 had been previously cancelled.

Remark

Applicant's arguments filed 05/03/2010, with respect to the rejections of claims 1 and 25 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-16, 18, 25, 27, 29-37, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 issued Sep. 9, 2008 in view of Marchisio et al., US 7,283,951 B2 issued on Oct. 16, 2007 (Marchisio, hereafter) further in view of Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 published Apr. 21, 2005 (Coiera, hereafter) and further in view of Bourdoncle et al., US 2002/0052894 A1 published May 2, 2002 (Bourdoncle, hereafter).

Regarding claim 1,

Vianello discloses **a method comprising:**

creating a data source of resource profiles associated with a plurality of resources, each resource the resources being at least one of a plurality of

resource types (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 17, lines 33-44, col. 15, line 10 et seq., and col. 22, line 11et seq., disclosing talent and employer profiles as resource profiles)**;**

approving whether or not a user can edit the resource profiles; editing the resource profiles based on the approval (See Vianello: Fig. 3 and 8: authorizing a user to edit a profile when registers or signs in (i.e., approving) as talent or employer);

receiving, through a user interface, first attributes of a resource desired by a user ;searching the data source of resource profiles for profiles having one or more of the first attributes (See Vianello: Fig. 4, Fig. 10, Col. 26, line 9 et seq., and col. 2, line 35 et seq., disclosing search interfaces receiving search keywords or attributes from a user and searching talent and job databases);

providing a hit-list of resources having the one or more first attributes (See Vianello: Fig. 4, box 409 and Fig. 10, box 1008);

storing the narrowed hit-list as a collection of resources which is used for further actions or stored as a persistent collection (See Vianello: Fig. 4, box 412 and Fig. 10, box 1010).

Vianello discloses all the limitations as stated above. Vianello further discloses narrowing or refining the search results based on certain skills possessed by talents (i.e., second attributes) (see at least col., 24, lines 34-37 and col. 43, lines 1-12). However, Vianello does not explicitly disclose **receiving second attributes of the resource through a refinement user interface; searching the hit-list for resources having the second attributes; providing a narrowed hit-list of resources having**

the first and second attributes. On the other hand, Marchisio discloses receiving

preference attributes (i.e. second attributes) to filter (i.e. refine) the search results

through a user interface wherein the filtered results (i.e. narrowed hit-list) have attributes

of the first search and the preference attributes (See Marchisio: Fig. 15 and col. 12,

lines 13-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Vianello with Marchisio's

teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above

teachings of Marchisio into the teachings of Vianello in order to receive second

attributes of the resource through a refinement user interface; search the hit-list for

resources having the second attributes; and provide a narrowed hit-list of resources

having the first and second attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to

allow increase the utility of the system and allow the user to narrow down the search

results through his/her preferences.

The combination of Vianello and Marchisio further discloses searching resource

profiles, refining, storing, and grouping the search results (See Vianello: Fig. 4, Fig. 10,

and col. 43, lines 17 et seq.)However, it does not explicitly disclose **receiving at least**

one selected resource type through the refinement user interface; providing a

second narrowed hit-list of resources having the selected resource type from the

narrowed hit-list; and storing the second narrowed hit-list as a second collection

of resources which is used for further actions or stored as a persistent collection.

On the other hand, Bourdoncle discloses selecting a category (i.e., type) through the

user interface to refine the search results and providing a narrowed search result having

the particular category or type (See Bourdoncle: [0038], [0045], and [0068]). Bourdoncle and Vianello are from the same field of endeavor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Marchisio with Bourdoncle's teaching. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Bourdoncle into the teachings of the combination of Vianello and Marchisio in order to receive at least one selected resource type through the refinement user interface; provide a second narrowed hit-list of resources having the selected resource type from the narrowed hit-list; and store the second narrowed hit-list as a second collection of resources which is used for further actions or stored as a persistent collection. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to navigate in all hits of the type or category while maintaining the focus on his search and finding the most relevant hits.

The combination of Vianello, Marchisio, and Bourdoncle discloses all the limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach **selecting a layout of the user interface from a plurality of layouts based on the first attributes, wherein the first and second attributes have dimensions, the method further comprising: creating segments of the hit-list by grouping the resources by one of the attribute dimensions and displaying statistics associated with the segments; receiving a selection of segments through the user interface; and providing a narrowed hit-list by selecting one or more resources from the selected segments.** On the other hand, Coiera discloses that a user can select the user interface layout such "simple

search" or "advance search" user interface lay outs; creating different segments by

grouping the search results into different categories (e.g., drug, education, textbook,...),

and each segment is associated with hit numbers as statistics, and user can select one

of the categories to get a narrowed hit result (See Coiera: Fig. 4-5, Fig. 9, Fig. 11,

[0063]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of the combination of

Vianello, Marchisio, and Bourdonclee with Coiera's teaching. A skilled artisan would

have been motivated to incorporate the above teachings of Coiera into the teachings of

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, and Bourdoncle in order to select a layout of the

user interface from a plurality of layouts based on the first attributes, wherein the first

and second attributes have dimensions, the method further comprising: creating

segments of the hit-list by grouping the resources by one of the attribute dimensions

and displaying statistics associated with the segments; receiving a selection of

segments through the user interface; and providing a narrowed hit-list by selecting one

or more resources from the selected segments. The motivation for doing so would have

been to increase the utility of the search system and allow a user to select a user

interface the way that fit his needs and categorize the search results to find the relevant

hit faster.

Regarding claim 3,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

displaying, in response to a user query, resources of the hit-list for user

inspection; maintaining a list of resources displayed for inspection by the user

(See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 displaying and storing search results); **displaying a**

search history of search queries previously entered by a user, including a list of

resources previously displayed; allowing the user to back-navigate to a search

within the search history by displaying the corresponding hit-list; and displaying

the list of inspected resources as the hit-list (See Coiera: [0016] and [0061]-[0062]

using saved search queries (i.e., history) allowing user to back-navigate the search the

saved searches).

Regarding claim 5,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

defining the resource profiles by facets, attributes, and descriptions of the

sources of the attributes (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 15, line 10

et seq., and col. 22, line 11et seq.).

Regarding claim 6,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

generating a pattern-based user interface of a search tool from the resource

profile (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Regarding claim 7,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

storing the narrowed hit-list as a collection of resources for using for further

actions or storing as a persistent collection (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 8,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

storing the collection of resources dynamically or statically (See Vianello: Fig. 4

and Fig. 10).

Regarding claims 9 and 10,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

aggregating the narrowed hit-list with an existing collection of resources, wherein

the existing collection of resources comprises an historical listing of aggregated

narrowed hit-lists (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 discloses storing of search results,

therefore, every time a user save existing search results it would be added to the

previous list).

Regarding claim 11,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

creating segments of the narrowed hit-list by discrete values of an attribute

dimension (See Coiera: Fig. 9 and 12).

Regarding claim 14,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

receiving attributes comprises receiving a search template from the user (See

Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Regarding claim 15,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses **the search template is defined by the user** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Regarding claim 16,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses **the search template comprises a multi-resource query that returns resources of more than one resource type** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006] and Fig. 9-11).

Regarding claim 18,

the combination of Vianello, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses **saving and re-using the search template can be saved and reused** (See Coiera: [0004]-[0006]).

Regarding claims 25, 27, 29, 30, and 32-36,

the scope of claims 25, 27, 29, 30, and 32-36 are substantially the same as claims 1, 3, 10, 5, 6, 7, and 9-11, respectively. Therefore, claims 25, 27, 29, 30, and 32-36 are rejected on the same basis as set forth for the rejections of claims 1, 3, 10, 5, 6, 7, and 9-11, respectively.

Regarding claim 37,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses **the narrowed hit-list is displayed based on the resource type** (See Bourdoncle: [0038], [0045], and [0068]).

Regarding claim 39,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

wherein the resource type is a person and the attributes include at least one of

licenses received, papers published, languages spoken, demographic

information, title in an organization, activities (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et

seq., disclosing the resource as talents which are persons having attributes such as

address, language, licenses).

Regarding claim 40,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

wherein a plurality of selected resource types are received through the

refinement user interface (See Bourdoncle: [0038], [0045], and [0068]).

Regarding claim 41,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

combining the stored collection of resources with a third collection of resources

to create a fourth collection of resources (Vianello discloses saving the search

results which are resources (e.g. talents), and every time a user save the search result

it combines the new search results with the old results, Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 42,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

storing a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed

hit-list (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 43,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

storing a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed

hit-list (See Vianello: Fig. 4 and Fig. 10, discloses saving the search results and Coiera

discloses typing a name for storing the search, see Coiera: [0061]).

Regarding claim 44,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses **the**

narrowed hit-list includes heterogeneous resources (See Coiera: Fig. 9 and Fig.

11).

Regarding claim 45,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

wherein the facets include at least one of collaboration, qualification, interests,

and activities (See Vianello: Fig. 2, col. 14, line 25 et seq., col. 17, lines 33-44, for

qualification and interests).

Regarding claim 46,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera **wherein the**

narrowed hit-list of resources I provided from the searched hit-list (See Marchisio:

col. 12, lines 13-42, filtered search result).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello,

US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Marchisio et al., US 7,283,951 B2 further in view of Coiera

et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 further in view of Bourdoncle et al., US 2002/0052894 A1

and further in view of Nardozzi et al., US 6,636,837 B1 issued Oct. 21, 2003 (Nardozzi, hereafter).

The combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses teaches all the limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach that **the search template is auto-configured based on the resource type, attributes or facets.** On the other hand, Nardozzi teaches the technique of allowing the automatic customizing of the screen for the user based on the past history or personal information of the user (see col. 7, lines 8-15, Nardozzi). Nardozzi and the combination of Vianello, Bourdoncle, and Coiera are from the same field of endeavor of displaying information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made having the teachings of Nardozzi to further modify the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera with Nardozzi's teachings. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to incorporated the technique of allowing the automatic customizing of the screen for the user based on the past history or personal information of the user (see col. 7, lines 8-15, Nardozzi) with search template of the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera in order to auto-customized (i.e., auto-configured) the search template based on the resource type because it facilitates the searching based on the user preferences resulting in saving time for the user.

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vianello, US 7,424,438 B2 in view of Marchisio et al., US 7,283,951 B2 further in view of

Coiera et al., US 2005/0086204 A1 further in view of Bourdoncle et al., US

2002/0052894 A1 and further in view of Jenkins, US 7,392,254 B1 issued June 24,

2008.

Regarding claim 19,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera discloses

teaches all the limitations as stated above. However, it does not explicitly teach that

using the hit-list to create a community, the community only including user

sharing the first attributes. On the other hand, Jenkins discloses creating a group of

users (i.e., community) using the search results sharing the same keywords (See

Jenkins: col. 9, lines 1-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time invention was made to further modify the combination of

Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera with Jenkins's teachings. A skilled artisan

would have been motivated to incorporated the above teachings of Jenkins the

combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, and Coiera in order to create a

community using the hit-list, the community only including user sharing the first

attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to help users involved in

common interests achieve their goals by collaborating and using each other knowledge.

Regarding claims 20,

the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle, Coiera, and Jenkins

discloses **providing contact information in response to a user query to enable**

communication with resources in the community (See Jenkins: col. 9, lines 48-63).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/03/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the Applicant's argument on pages 3 and 4 of the Remark that Marchisio does not teach the claimed "searching the hit-list having the second attributes" as recited in claims 1 and 25 at least because Marchisio searches its entire data set, not a hit-list, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Marchisio as disclosed in at least Fig. 15 and col. 12, lines 13-42 clearly discloses that in one embodiment "these attributes [preferences] are used to **filter the results of a syntactic search**" (emphasis added). Therefore, preferences or second attributes (e.g., names of countries, states, regions, dates, etc) are used to filter or refine the result of a search (i.e. hit-list). The preferences (i.e. second attributes) of Marchisio are used to filter the result of the search, not entire data set based on locations or dates. Thus, Marchisio clearly teaches the claimed "searching the hit-list having the second attributes" as recited in claims 1 and 25.

Regarding the Applicant's argument on page 5 of the Remark that Bourdoncle does not teach or suggest providing the claimed "second narrowed hit-list of resources having selected resources type from the narrowed hit-list", as recited in claims 1 and 25, because Bourdoncle teaches expanding the hit-list, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bourdoncle in at least paragraphs 24, 38, and 54 clearly discloses **refinement strategies** for a user including using relevant categories or types selected among a set

of predefined categories which refine the hit list. Bourdoncle clearly teaches refining or

narrowing the hit-list. Therefore, Bourdoncle teaches providing the claimed "second

narrowed hit-list of resources having selected resources type from the narrowed hit-list",

as recited in claims 1 and 25.

Regarding the Applicant's argument on page 7 of the Remark that none of the

applied references teaches or suggests the claimed "storing a narrowed collection of

resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed hit-list", as recited in claim 42, the

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Vianello in Fig. 4 and Fig. 10 discloses saving a subset of search results (e.g.

search results yield "Blind" talent profiles) which corresponds to the limitation of "storing

a narrowed collection of resources by selecting a subset of the narrowed hit-list", as

recited in claim 42.

Regarding the Applicant's argument on page 6 of the Remark that next Office

Action should be non-final because the office failed to withdraw the rejection over

Bourdoncle even though Applicant's argument were admittedly persuasive, the

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant tries to argue against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA

1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In the last Office Action the examiner admitted that Applicant's argument with

regard to the **combination** of Vianello, Bourdoncle and Coiera were persuasive and

therefore withdrew the rejection and introduced a new ground of rejection under a new

combination of prior art. The Examiner accepted that Bourdoncle in conjunction with

Vianello and Coiera as a whole failed to teach the limitations of claims 1 and 25.

However, under the new rejection presented in the last Office Action, Bourdoncle

in the new combination of prior art, the combination of Vianello, Marchisio, Bourdoncle,

and Coiera, in conjunction with other references teaches limitations of claims 1 and 25,

see above. The Applicant should avoid arguing the references individually and should

consider the rejection based on combination of references as a whole.

In view of the above, the Office Action has properly determined the scope and

content of the prior art and properly ascertained the differences between the prior art

and the claimed invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hares Jami whose telephone number is 571-270-1291.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hares Jami
Examiner,
Art Unit 2162

HJ

/John Breene/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162